DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 862 SP 033 631

AUTHOR Anderson, Debra J.
TITLE A Quantitative Analysis of Student Teacher Supervision Models: Implications for the Role of University Supervisors.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Orlando, FL, February 15-19, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Models; National Surveys; Preservice Teacher Education; Questionnaires; *Student Teacher Supervisors; Student Teaching; *Supervisory Methods; *Teacher Role; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

Teacher education institutions (N=197) were surveyed to determine what effect, if any, the reform movement has had on student teaching supervision, particularly on the role of university supervisors. In addition, institutions were asked about trends in and concerns about supervision. Findings indicate that: (1) the majority (86.8 percent) of institutions use a traditional model of student teaching supervision; (2) some institutions (16.8 percent) have changed their model of supervision in the past 5 years (changes were made to the traditional model, the clinical professor model, the teacher adjunct model, and the master teacher-apprentice model); (3) the role of university supervisors remains largely traditional; (4) the trends cited most often by respondents incorporate some of the ideas promoted by the Holmes Group, including professional development schools; and (5) teacher educators are concerned that program changes reflect improvement, not budgetary decisions. The questionnaire is included in the text. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343862

A Quantitative Analysis of Student Teacher Supervision Models: Implications for the Role of University Supervisors

Research Report Presented
at the Annual Meeting of the
Association of Teacher Educators

February 15-19, 1992

ORLANDO, FLORIDA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Debra J. Anderson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Debra J. Anderson
Director of Student Teaching
St. Olaf College
Northfield, Minnesota

SP033 631

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Quantitative Analysis of Student Teaching Supervision Models: Implications for the Role of University Supervisors

by

Debra J. Anderson

New approaches to supervising student teachers are being discussed and developed. For example, the Holmes Group (1986) recommends that professional preparation for teaching begins after the baccalaureate is earned. In this model, students complete an internship (student teaching) during the fifth year while concurrently enrolled in professional education courses. The Holmes Group model promotes professional development schools, a clinical approach toward supervision, and the empowerment of classroom teachers as supervisors of student teachers.

This model has certain implications for university supervisors. Although their roles in some fifth year programs vary, supervisors, in the traditional sense of supervision are nonexistent, because classroom teacher educators serving as mentors to student teachers assume most of the responsibility for supervision. It is envisioned, however, that in these programs, university supervisors will assume new responsibilities, much like those performed by doctors working with interns in a clinical setting.

Objectives

In writing about the present status of and future trends in the supervision of student teachers for a book on supervision (Anderson, Major & Mitchell, 1992), we began to question what effect, if any, the reform movement in teacher education has had on student teaching supervision and particularly, upon the role of university supervisors. We wanted to know how many teacher preparing institutions presently subscribe to a traditional model of student teaching supervision; how many use other models; how many have recently changed models; in which ways these changes in models affect the role of university supervisors; and what major trends exist in student teaching supervision. We discovered

that statistics concerning the number of institutions using various models of student teaching supervision were nonexistent. Therefore, a questionnaire was developed to survey institutions across the nation to obtain answers to these questions.

Design

The questionnaire was kept simple in design. Colleagues were asked to: 1) check the model of university supervision that most accurately describes how the majority of their student teachers are supervised, and 2) write the approximate number of teachers their institution graduated during the 1990-91 school year (see Figure 1). On the reverse side of the one page questionnaire, several optional questions were posed (see Figure 2). Responses to these questions are discussed later.

The five models of supervision identified by MacNaughton, Johns and Rogus (1978) were used to classify the different models of student teaching supervision. These models are: 1) The Traditional Model, 2) The Modified Traditional Model, 3) The Clinical Professor Model, 4) The Teacher Adjunct Model, and 5) The Master Teacher-Apprentice Model. They base the models on a literature review and input from consultants in state and private teacher preparing institutions (p. 20). The models illustrate how the roles and responsibilities of university supervisors and classroom teacher educators vary. Model names which actually classify classroom teacher educators also indirectly indicate the role of university supervisors.

For the sake of brevity on the questionnaire, the original descriptions of each model were modified to emphasize the roles and responsibilities of university supervisors (see Figure 1).

Questionnaires were sent to Directors of Clinical Experiences at 300 American Colleges and Universities. Institutions were randomly selected from the Directory of Collegiate Field Experience Administrators (1988-90). Every fourth institution of the approximately 1200 listed in the Directory was selected.

Figure 1

10/91

QUESTIONNAIRE

A Quantitative Analysis of Student Teaching Models: Implications for the Role of University Supervisors

Dear Colleague:

We need your help. Would you please 1) check the model of university supervision that best describes how the majority of your student teachers are supervised, and 2) indicate the approximate number of first year teachers your college/university graduated during the 1990-1991 school year.

1. Please check the model of university supervision that most accurately describes how the majority of your student teachers are supervised.

_____ The Traditional Model: The university supervisor's role is to observe student student teachers, consult with cooperating teachers, and formally assess the student teacher's effectiveness in relation to program objectives.

_____ The Modified Traditional Model: The university supervisor's role is to cluster student teachers at one site so that in addition to providing on-site supervision, the supervisor may coordinate field work, gather evaluations, and manage in-service work and curriculum development activity.

_____ The Clinical Professor Model (The Laboratory School Model): The university supervisor and classroom teacher educator are one. The university supervisor works with pre-student teachers, student teachers, and practicing teachers and may also coordinate teacher in-service activities on site.

_____ The Teacher Adjunct Model: The university supervisor's role is to maintain close contact with the classroom teacher educator, but he/she generally does not supervise the pre-student teachers or student teachers. The university supervisor provides liaison and program coordinating services, including curriculum development and in-service assistance.

_____ Master Teacher-Apprentice Model: The role of the university supervisor does not exist since the supervisor only records the final grade.

2. Please write the approximate number of teachers your institution graduated during the 1990-1991 school year _____

We thank you in advance for taking time out of your busy schedule to assist us. The findings will be presented at the ATE annual meeting in February, and will, of course, be available to you upon your request.

Sincerely,

Debra J. Anderson, Director
Student Teaching & Certification
St. Olaf College

Robert L. Major
Professor of Curriculum & Instruction
Mankato State University

Over Please

Figure 2

Optional

3. Has your model of supervision changed in the past five years?
   Yes_____ No_____

   a. If so, from which model did your institution change?

4. In your opinion, what is the major role of the university supervisor today?

5. In your opinion, what do you see as major trends in student teaching supervision?

6. Other comments:

Check box if
you want results
sent to you.

Thank You!

Data was collected from November 4, 1991 through January 10, 1992, based on 1990-91 academic year information. This time period was selected because it was well after the fall term began, but before the holidays. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included to expedite and increase the number of questionnaires returned.

Of the 300 questionnaires mailed, 211 were returned. Of the 211, twelve were returned due to changes in directors and two institutions indicated closure. The twelve with changes were corrected and mailed again in December. The adjusted survey population was 298. The final return rate was 197/298 or 66.1%.

Findings

Stated below are the survey questions and a summary of the data collected from responding institutions.

Question # 1. Check the model of university supervision that most accurately describes how the majority of your student teachers are supervised.

As shown in Table 1, the number and percentage of institutions using each model of student teaching supervision is as follows: Traditional = 171 (86.8%); Modified Traditional = 29 (14.7%); Clinical Professor = 12 (6%); Teacher Adjunct = 1 (0.5%); and the Master Teacher-Apprentice Model = 3 (1.5%). These percentages do not add up to 100% because some institutions use more than one model, i.e., sixteen of the 171 institutions using the Traditional Model use an additional model; twelve of the 29 institutions using the Modified Traditional Model use an additional model; six of the twelve using the Clinical Professor Model use an additional model; the one institution using the Teacher Adjunct Model also uses another model; and all three of the institutions using the Master Teacher-Apprentice Model use additional models. Table 1 clearly indicates that an overwhelming majority (86.8%) of the institutions use the Traditional Model for student teaching supervision.

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Institutions Using Various Models of Student TeachingSupervision

Model	Number of Institutions	Percentage	Number of Institutions Using Other Models
Traditional	171	86.8%	16
Modified Traditional	29	14.7%	12
Clinical Professor	12	6%	6
Teacher Adjunct	1	0.5%	1
Master Teacher-Apprentice	3	1.5%	3

Question # 2. Write the approximate number of teachers your institution graduated during the 1990-91 school year.

Data collected for question two is shown in Table 2. It illustrates the number and percentage of institutions responding to the questionnaire along with the interval of the approximate number of teachers graduated during the 1990-91 academic year. Intervals are equivalent to 100 teachers graduated with the exception of the first two. The first two intervals represent 1 to 50 and 51 to 100 teachers graduated because of the high number of institutions responding with fewer than 100 teachers graduated. Fourteen institutions did not respond to question two.

The data in Table 2 shows that over one half (57.9%) of responding institutions graduated 100 or fewer teachers in 1990-91; 18.4% graduated 101-300 teachers; 9.1% graduated 301-500 teachers; 5.5% graduated 501-800 teachers; and 2.0% graduated 801-1200 teachers.

As shown, Table 3 illustrates a breakdown of the number of institutions in each interval using the five different models of student teaching supervision. Keep in mind as you read the table that some institutions use more than one model. Therefore, the sum of the number of institutions in each interval does not always equal the total number of institutions within that particular interval. The fourteen institutions not responding to question number two are listed separately. The data in Table 3 indicates that the majority of responding institutions use the Traditional Model of student teaching supervision, no matter the institutional size.

The approximate number and percentage of teachers graduated in 1990-91 within each interval are shown in Table 4. Approximately 32,015 teachers graduated from institutions responding to the questionnaire. This data helps to draw conclusions about the number of student teachers supervised through the different models by institutional size. Of the responding institutions, 15.5% of the teachers graduated in 1990-91 from institutions preparing 100 or fewer teachers; 22.7% graduated from institutions preparing 101-300 teachers; 23.3% graduated from institutions preparing 301-500 teachers;

Table 2

Number and Percentage of Responding Institutions by Size

Interval of Number of Teachers Graduated 1990-1991	Number	Percentage
1-50	78	39.6%
51-100	36	18.3%
101-200	18	9.2%
201-300	18	9.2%
301-400	4	2.0%
401-500	14	7.1%
501-600	4	2.0%
601-700	3	1.5%
701-800	4	2.0%
801-900	1	0.5%
901-1000	1	0.5%
1000+	2	1.0%
*	14	7.1%
TOTAL =	197	100 %

*Note: No data regarding the number of teachers graduated was given.

Table 3

Number of Institutions by Size Using Various Models

Number of Teachers Graduated 1990-1991	Number of Institutions	Traditional	Modified Traditional	Clinical Professor	Teacher Adjunct	MasterTeacher Apprentice
1-50	78	70	9	3		
51-100	36	32	4	1		1
101-200	18	15	3	3		
201-300	18	15	1	2		1
301-400	4	4				
401-500	14	12	3			
501-600	4	3	1			
601-700	3	2	1	1		
701-800	4	4	1			
801-900	1	1	1			
901-1000	1	1				
1000+	2	2				
*	14	9	5	2	1	1

*Note: No data regarding the number of teachers graduated was given.

Table 4

Approximate Number and Percentage of Teachers Graduated as Reported by Institutions

Interval of Number of Teachers Graduated 1990-1991	Approximate Number of Teachers Graduated 1990-1991	Percentage of Teachers Graduated 1990-1991
1-50	2,361	7.4%
51-100	2,586	8.1%
101-200	2,787	8.7%
201-300	4,386	14.0%
301-400	1,042	3.2%
401-500	6,456	20.1%
501-600	2,848	8.8%
601-700	1,400	4.4%
701-800	3,884	12.1%
801-900	865	2.7%
901-1000	1,000	3.1%
1000+	2,400	7.4%
	TOTAL = 32,015	100%

25.3% graduated from those preparing 501-800 teachers; and 13.2% graduated from institutions preparing 801-1200 teachers.

On the reverse side of the questionnaire, three optional questions were posed and a space for additional comments was provided (see Figure 2). The questions and a summary of the responses follow.

Question # 3. Has your model of supervision changed in the past five years? If so, from which model did your institution change?

This is a straightforward question open to various interpretations. Even so, 123 (62.4%) said "no change"; 33 (16.8%) said "yes"; and 41(20.8%) did not respond. Of the 123 who said "no change", 12 (6%) use a model other than the Traditional Model. Several who said "yes" alluded to minor changes. Of the 33 who said "yes", three changed to the Traditional Model, seven to the Clinical Professor Model, two to the Teacher Adjunct Model, and one to the Master Teacher-Apprentice Model.

Question #4. In your opinion, what is the major role of the university supervisor today?

There were 126 responses to this question. The roles mentioned most often were:

To help bridge the gap between theory and practice; processing of the student teaching experience; providing feedback and evaluation

To facilitate the student teaching experience and program objectives with the cooperating teacher

To provide on-site support, supervision and assistance

To serve as a liaison, a communication link with the cooperating teacher, student teacher, school district and college/university

To nurture the student teachers' development

To serve as a coach, resource person, counselor, advisor, mediator, problem-solver, consultant, mentor, and

To coordinate all aspects of the student teachers' field experiences; major tasks include: site selection, student teacher orientation, consistent monitoring of performance, and final evaluation of the student teachers'performance.

Some additional roles mentioned, but less often, include:

To select cooperating teachers

To offer additional assistance to school-based personnel as needed

To integrate on-going graduate course work with future teachers' work in the schools

To serve as a model teacher in the schools

To teach classroom management and instruction skills

To provide "snapshot data" overlooked by daily supervisor

To teach seminars and human relations, and

To provide more placements in different schools and with different cooperating teachers.

Question #5. In your opinion, what do you see as major trends in student teaching supervision?

There were 108 responses to this question. The trends cited most often were:

Greater collaboration between the college/university and P-12 schools

Professional development schools

Empowering classroom teachers with supervision

Clinical approach toward supervision

Lengthening the student teaching experience

More training for cooperating teachers

More training for university supervisors, and

Clustering student teachers.

Other responses to question five on trends, but mentioned to a lesser extent include:

Cohort Groups - John Goodlad philosophy

More pre-student teaching field experiences under same cooperating teachers

Too much movement in the direction of non-supervisory role of the university supervisor

Reaffirming the status quo

Increasing use of videotaping and pre-observation conferences

Team teaching because good cooperating teachers are reluctant to release their classes due to accountability and publishing of test results

Competency-based teacher education

Always need the traditional model...not enough good secondary school teachers in any one district to cluster student teachers

Change in assessment instruments for student teachers, e.g. portfolio

Increasing need to provide on-the-job training as more states create alternative options for liberal arts graduates to pursue certification while teaching

Elevating the status of cooperating teachers to adjunct status, and

Trend to "guarantee" the product.

Question five touched an emotional button for many. A few representative comments that may give you a flavor include the following:

"The major trend I see is not describable, in my opinion: it is for the clinical professor to be more technical, less supportive and too bound by research requirements."

"I see alot of discussion, but not any trends emerging - unless you take into account ways of providing fewer university supervisors to save money. I am afraid many of these emerging trends are budget driven rather than programmatic improvements."

"I see them [student teachers] being turned over to graduate assistants and professors who do not want to supervise. It has been reduced to almost a level of punishment."

"Our university is abandoning the responsibility and I think we'll regret it."

Question #6. Comments:

Seventeen respondents wrote additional comments. A few of these comments include:

"Our major problem is that we have to depend too much on adjunct professors for supervision. This is especially true to colleges under 3000 total enrollment. Why do we (the college presidents) feel that part-time employees can do this supervision? We definitely need to move the student teaching experience more up to date in theory rather than just having the student emulate the methods of the classroom supervisor. We need to really develop supervision better. Grants to bring them on campus would help!"

> "Without strong 'interference' from the outside, our program will continue to deteriorate. Our director even lacks background experience in supervision as well as teaching."
>
> "Teacher education is a total professional responsibility. We need professional educators committed to the education of those entering the field. Teacher education needs to be adopted by both institutions as a commitment to the future. We've been a step-child too long."
>
> "I don't think student teaching is a valid culminating experience. Throughout the course work we show how teaching could and perhaps should be done. Then put them into student teaching and evaluate them on how well they fit into the present school system. Negates the other work."

In summary, the findings indicate that: 1) the majority (86.8%) of institutions use the Traditional Model of student teaching supervision; 2) 123 (62.4%) of the institutions indicate no change in their model of supervision during the past five years; 3) 33 (16.8%) indicate a change in their model of supervision (of these 33, three changed to the Traditional Model, seven to the Clinical Professor Model, two to the Teacher Adjunct Model, and one to the Master Teacher-Apprentice Model); 4) 10% of responding institutions use more than one model of student teaching supervision; 5) only two institutions use more than two models; 6) 57.9% of the responding institutions graduated 100 or fewer teachers in 1990-91; 7) the majority (61.5%) of teachers graduated from institutions preparing fewer than 500 teachers; 8) the major role of university supervisors remains traditional; and 9) the major trends cited in student teaching supervision are reflected in the ideals of the Holmes Group model and the Clinical Professor Model of supervision.

Discussion

What effect, if any, has the reform movement in teacher education had on student teaching supervision and particularly, on the roles of university supervisors? Based on the findings, the answer to the first part of the question is <u>not much effect</u>, since an overwhelming majority (86.8%) of responding institutions use a Traditional Model of student teaching supervision. It is interesting to note, however, that 10% of the institutions

use more than one model and only two institutions use more than two models. It is also interesting to note that three institutions indicate a change to the Traditional Model during the past five years, seven to the Clinical Professor Model, two to the Teacher Adjunct Model, and one to the Master Teacher-Apprentice Model. The greatest change in models (which is only 3%) is to the Clinical Professor Model. Of the five models of supervision, the Clinical Professor Model is the most closely associated to the ideals of the Holmes Group model, i.e., professional development schools, clinical approach toward supervision, empowerment of classroom teacher educators, etc.

The Clinical Professor Model does effect a change in the role of university supervisors. In this model, supervisors work on-site with pre-student teachers, student teachers and practicing teachers, and may also coordinate teacher in-service activities. Spending more time on-site and providing in-service activities are two new roles for many university supervisors. Needless to say, if university supervisors are to assume new roles for any model of supervision, then they must be prepared for these new responsibilities (Abruscato, 1972; Anderson, 1991; Anderson, Major, & Mitchell, 1992; Marrou, 1988; Liston & Zeichner, 1988; Scholl, 1990). By and large, however, the responding institutions report that the major role of university supervisors remains traditional.

Several respondents wrote lengthy comments about their concern for budgetary decisions influencing changes in supervision. For example, one respondent wrote, "I am afraid many of these emerging trends are budget driven rather than programmatic improvements." The point is well taken anytime we face budget cuts. Do we hire adjunct supervisors and graduate assistants to supervise student teachers because they are less expensive that full-time faculty? Are adjunct supervisors and graduate assistants allowed to supervise without appropriate training? Do we turn over the education of student teachers to the K-12 schools? Regarding the latter question, one respondent wrote, "Our university is abandoning the responsibility and I think we'll regret it."

As teacher education institutions develop and shape new models of student teaching supervision, the following questions might be considered: What is really best for the student teacher? What does research tell us about the most effective approach(es) to supervision? And, what doour years of experience tell us about the need to prepare cooperating teachers and university supervisors for their roles?

This study also reveals information about institutional size and the number of student teachers supervised through the different models. The majority (61.5%) of teachers graduated in 1990-91 from institutions preparing 500 or fewer teachers. And the majority of these institutions use the Traditional Model of student teaching supervision. Even the institutions who graduated 1,000 to 1,200 teachers indicate they use the Traditional Model. Therefore, one might conclude that the majority of teachers are supervised through a Traditional Model of supervision, no matter the institutional size.

Conclusions

Based on data collected from 197 teacher education institutions about the models of student teaching supervision being used, the role of supervisors, trends in supervision, and concerns about supervision, the following conclusions are drawn.

1. The majority (86.8%) of institutions use a traditional model of student teaching supervision, no matter the institutional size.

2. 16.8% of the institutions have changed their model of supervision in the past five years.

3. The role of university supervisors remains largely traditional.

4. The trends cited most often by respondents incorporate some of the ideas promoted by the Holmes Group.

5. Teacher educators are concerned that program changes reflect improvement, not budgetary decisions.

Recommendations for Further Research

Several problems the author became aware of during this study are listed below. These problems are suggested for further research.

1. Conduct a national survey of all teacher education institutions similar to the one conducted in this study (funds limited this survey to only one fourth of the institutions).

2. Study the top 100 teacher producing institutions because they prepare the majority of teachers.

3. Analyze the role of university supervisors involved in fifth year programs.

References

Abruscato, J. (1972). The college supervisor of student teachers. Improving College and University Teaching. 20, (2), 146-147.

Anderson, D. J. (1991), Future directions for the preparation of university supervisors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans, Louisianna, February 16-20. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, ED 330 652.

Anderson, D. J., Major, R. L. and Mitchell, R. R. (1992). Teacher supervision that works: A guide for university supervisors. Praeger, Greenwood Publishing Company, New York, New York.

Directory of Collegiate Field Experience Administrators. (1988-90). Volume I, Number 6, Association of Teacher Educators, 1900 Association Drive, Suite ATE. Reston, Virginia, 22091. Compiled by National Field Directors Forum.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, Michigan.

Liston, D. and Zeichner, K. (1988). Critical pedagogy and teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, Louisianna, April 5-9. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, ED 295 937.

MacNaughton, R., Johns, F., and Rogus, J. (1978). Alternative models for revitalizing the school-university partnership. Action in Teacher Education, 1, 1, 18-29.

Marrou, J. (1988). The university supervisor: A new role in a changing workplace. The Teacher Educator, 24, (3), 13-19.

Scholl, R. (1990). University supervisor: Circuit rider or teacher educator. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators. Las Vegas, Nevada. February 5-8. Eric Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, ED 317 506.